

[4th February 1925]

Remission of assessment on flood-affected double-crop lands.

*56 Q.—Mr. J. A. SALDANHA: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to refer to his answer to question No. 568 (2) given on 10th October 1924 in which reference is made to the answer to question No. 887 given on 3rd April 1924 and state up to what extent and on what principle Government have granted remission of taxation in case of double-crop wet lands on which the first crop was destroyed by floods and only second wet crop was raised?

A.—No remission was granted in the case of double-crop lands in the South Kanara district on which the first crop was destroyed by the floods of 1923 but a second crop was raised.

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA:—“ May I know whether the Government have decided to grant no remissions ? ”

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS:—“ I understand the question relates to the last fasli. The Government do not wish to do anything further than what has already been done.”

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA:—“ What has been done already ? There was a definite request from Mr. Hegde and the late Revenue Member, the Raja of Kollengode, promised to inquire into the matter and the reduction proposed was to the extent of two-thirds. I want to know what has been done and what is proposed to be done by the Government ? ”

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS:—“ The answer states that no remission was granted and the Government do not propose to grant any such remission.”

Alleged distress warrants for recovery of survey fees in Tanjore town.

*57 Q.—Mr. S. SATYAMURTI: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether under the Madras Survey and Boundaries Act IV of 1887 distress warrants for attachment of properties have been quite recently issued on a large scale for alleged survey fees due within the Tanjore town ;

(b) whether the first and the only intimation that the party gets is when the Revenue officer walks into his house and demands money and threatens distraint and no details are given as to how and when the liability arose ; and

(c) whether the Government propose to see that notice is given to the parties before any further steps are taken ?

A.—(a) The Government have no information but have called for a report.

(b) No.

(c) Section 8 of the Survey and Boundaries Act VIII of 1923 provides for the issue of such notices.

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—“ Will the Government be pleased to lay the report on the table of the House ? ”

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS:—“ That will be considered when the report is received.”

4th February 1925]

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“With reference to clause (e), I know that the section provides for the issue of such notices. Apart from the presumption I want to know whether any step has been taken to the serving of these notices to the parties before taking action.”

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS :—“If the reports show that such notices have not been served the Government will have to consider what steps are necessary.”

Local Boards and Municipal Councils.

Dindigul Municipality.

* 58 Q.—**Mr. A. CHIDAMBARA NADAR** : Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) how long the privilege of electing its chairman was enjoyed by the Dindigul municipality and why it was withdrawn;

(b) whether the council was given an opportunity of explaining the grounds on which the privilege was withdrawn;

(c) whether all the papers relating to the grounds on which the Government took action were placed before the municipal council;

(d) if the Government thought that the municipal council was incompetent to discharge its duties, why the extreme step of withdrawing the privilege of electing its chairman was taken, when they would have acted under section 41 of the District Municipalities Act either by dissolving or superseding the council;

(e) whether the Collector of the Madura district was consulted with regard to the matter and whether it was on his advice that the privilege was withdrawn;

(f) whether the then chairman was asked to explain the conduct of the council in the light of the report of the Collector;

(g) whether the Government will place on the table all the correspondence that took place in connexion with the withdrawal of the privilege;

(h) whether the Government received any mahazar from the electorate of the municipality and a copy of the resolutions passed at a meeting held on 28th August 1924 at Dindigul;

(i) whether the Government made any private inquiry or at least tried to know the wishes of the people of the municipality in connexion with the matter;

(j) whether the Government had any object in view in enlarging the number of councillors from 17 to 24 by G.O. No 2638, dated 23rd September 1924, especially after the council was asked to state their reasons why the privilege of electing its chairman should not be withdrawn; and

(k) the number and the names of municipal councillors who resigned after the withdrawal of the privilege?

A.—(a) The Council was enjoying the privilege since 1885. The reasons for the withdrawal of the privilege are contained in Notification No. 1113 published in Part I-A of the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 11th November 1924, and placed on the Council Table on 3rd December 1924.

(b) The answer is in the affirmative.